

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1-20 are pending in the present application, with claim 1 being the sole independent claim. Based on the above amendments and following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that all outstanding objections and rejections be withdrawn.

The Office Action on page 2, in sections 2-6, rejects claims 4, 8-10, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As per claim 4, the Office Action asserts that the recitation "said index" lacks antecedent basis. Claim 4 has been editorially amended to recite "including an index obtained by the searching of said address searcher."

As per claim 8, the Office Action asserts that the recitation of "the fourth layer or a layer there above" lacks antecedent basis. Claim 8 has been editorially amended to recite "the fourth layer or a layer thereabove of the Open Systems Interconnection (OSI) reference model." Because the OSI reference model is well known, Applicants respectfully asserts that claim 8 is now definite.

As per claims 9, 10, 17, and 18, the Office Action asserts that the recitation of "the second layer of the protocol" lacks antecedent basis. Claims 9, 10, 17, and 18 have been editorially amended "the second layer of the Open Systems Interconnection (OSI) reference model." Because the OSI reference model is well known, Applicants respectfully asserts that claims 9, 10, 17, and 18 is now definite.

The Office Action on pages 3- 7, in sections 7-19, rejects claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,359,879 to Carvey. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In asserting the rejection, the Office Action aligns the recited identification key with the flow identifier of Carvey and the recited transmission control rule with the forwarding table of Carvey. The Office Action further aligns the recitation that "transmission of said diagram is controlled in accordance with the selected transmission control rule" with the assertion in Carvey that the datagram is forwarded on the selected trunk. See, Carvey, col. 5, lines 30-50.

Amended claim 1 recites now that "a combination of attribute information types employed for transmission control is searched using a destination address of a received datagram." In an exemplary embodiment of the invention, as is now recited in claim 1, the datagram transmission device searches a combination of attribute information types employed for transmission control using the destination address of a received datagram. See, e.g., Specification, page 7, lines 9-19. In such an embodiment, the device executes transmission control using one or more of attribute information including, for example, a transmission source IP address, a higher rank protocol identifier, a transmission control flag, a transmission source port number, and a destination port number. Further, the types and number of attribute information employed may differ depending on the destination address.

Carvey does not teach or suggest that "a combination of attribute information types employed for transmission control is searched using a destination address of a received datagram." Instead, Carvey employs only the source address as the attribute information type. Therefore, Carvey does not teach a device wherein "a combination of attribute information types employed for transmission control is searched using a destination address of a received datagram." Hence, Applicants respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Carvey and therefore allowable over Carvey.

Claims 2-20 depend variously from claim 1 and are allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Dated: April 25, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 
James R. Burdett

Registration No.: 31,594
Daniel G. Vivarelli, Jr.
Registration No.: 51,137
VENABLE LLP
P.O. Box 34385
Washington, DC 20043-9998
(202) 344-4000
(202) 344-8300 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicant

DC2/642000